



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—PIERRE D'URTE AND THE BASK LANGUAGE.¹

THE TRANSLATOR.

Some account of Pierre d'Urte may be seen in *La Revue de Linguistique*, Tome 30, p. 221. We there learn that he was alive and, apparently, in London, in October 1719; was probably identical with a person registered at St. Jean de Luz in 1669; and also that he contributed to the collection of versions of the Lords Prayer published by John Chamberlayne² at Amsterdam in 1715. It is to Professors J. Vinson and J. Rhys that we owe the discovery and collection of the few scraps of information about the man that have been transmitted. It was the latter who reported the existence of his manuscripts to Prince L. L. Bonaparte, from whom their fame spread in Baskland. No mention of him has been found in the archives of the French Protestants in Canterbury. It is likely, however, that, when the registers of burials in England during the 18th century shall have been published, one will find out where he lies buried. More may be said about his name than about his life. It is composed seemingly of the French 'de' and 'Urte' the name of a Bask village, which is subject to inundations from the river Adour, the eastern boundary of Baskland, and has almost lost its proper language in presence of Gascon and French. This name is generally modernised into 'Ahurte', either by the prefixing of French 'à' or by analogy from 'aurthen', = 'horno, hoc anno'. Jean de Perochegi in his '*Origen de la Nacion Vascongada y su Lengua*' (53. c. in M. J. Vinsons very useful Bibliography, Paris, 1891 and '98) thus defines the word, p. 8, "El nombre de Hurte ò de Hurte-à, quiere decir 'Diluvio', y aora se

¹ *Anecdota Oxoniensia*. The Earliest Translation of the Old Testament into the Basque Language (a fragment), by Pierre d'Urte of St. Jean de Luz, circ. 1700. Edited from a MS in the Library of Shirburn Castle,* Oxfordshire, by Llewelyn Thomas, M. A. (Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1894).

* As King Alfred the Great mentions the Wáscan it is interesting to know that the liber de Hyda is kept there, not far from d'Urtes Vasconian books.

² The Rev. H. E. Salter, Vicar of Shirburn, by Watlington Railway Station (G. W. R.), says that this gentleman did not belong to the family of the same name whose epitaphs exist in Shirburn Church.

advierde que tambien significa 'año', y como el Diluvio universal durò un año, se saca la consecuencia de haver quedado synonomos ambos nombres y reducidos à una sola voz 'Hurte-à' que comprende 'año', y 'diluvio'." But Pouvreau in his precious, but never published, Dictionary of 1665, has 'dur' as a synonym of 'ur' meaning 'water' or 'river'. Sometimes, in Scottish English for instance, 'water' means 'river'. 'Dur', of course, is Keltic for water. The name of Durango in Biscaya, as Andres de Poça (Bilbao, 1597) records, has been thought to mean "the other side of the water." Now 'urte' is but the infinitive or verbal noun of 'ur'. It means 'watering', 'flowing', 'flooding', 'leaking', 'going out', 'running out', and these ideas describe a year no less than an 'inundation' or 'flood'. So the real, inner, original meaning of 'ur' ('water') is probably 'that which runs out and melts away'. It explains the Baskish word for 'blue', 'grey', namely 'urdiña', which signifies 'worthy of water', 'like water', 'water colour'. The second element in this comes, like 'dina' in old Portuguese, from the Latin 'digna'. It seems to give an etymon to some Latin and Greek words. In the Proverbs ('Refranes y Sentencias') printed in Pamplona in 1596, p. 48, 'hurte' translates 'salir' speaking of 'smoke issuing'; p. 49 it is used of 'a bear leaving' his cave; p. 33 of a 'birote', or 'arrow coming out' of its quiver. It also occurs there several times in the sense of 'año', 'year'. In Exodus 'urthuco' is the future participle of the radical meaning 'melt', 'become liquid'.

THE MERITS OF D'URTES VERSION.

The literary charm of d'Urtes style is considerable. His translation may safely be used as an easy book for beginners, being on the whole very carefully and grammatically written, and extremely faithful to the French. This, of course, is to be understood after making the corrections here below indicated, and already partly carried out in the 2nd edition of the Genesis. He may have used as its basis "La Sainte Bible. A Geneve, Pour la Compagnie des Libraires. M. D. CCV," which has the Press-Mark 3025 g. 10. B at the British Museum; or the edition of D. Martin, published at Amsterdam in 1707, which has the Shelf-Mark Bib. Fr. 1707. b. I, at the Bodleian Library, Oxford. He seems to have followed with slavish fidelity those peculiarities of J. Calvins text which are noticed by readers who are familiar with the English Authorised Version of 1611. His language is

still current in the northern part of French Baskland, the region called 'le Labourd', in Baskish 'Laphurdi', i. e. 'robbers (or ? 'pirates') horde', a name which recalls "the pirate coast," a part of the Arabian littoral of the Persian Gulf. But there is no writer living who handles it so well as he did. His book has provided some additions to the Word-books. It is linguistically superior to the translation of Captain Duvoisin (London, 1859). The Basks ought to be very grateful to the Earl of Macclesfield, to Mr. Llewelyn Thomas, (both now dead) and to the Delegates of the Clarendon Press, who arranged for its publication. The Rev. J. I. de Arana, the well-known Gipuskoan author and Jesuit Priest, who had been censor of Baskish books for the Bishop of Vitoria, and who died at Oña, Provincia de Burgos, at the end of 1896, wrote to me on receiving a copy of the Oxford edition: "Mr. Thomas a fait un grand bien à la littérature Basque en éditant l'écrit de St. Jean de Luz, circa 1700. Avec toutes ses imperfections et négligences, ce livre Euskarien montre un langage Basque si fluide et naturel, comme on parle encore dans les petits peuples' près de Sara et St. Jean de Luz. Après avoir lu quelques pages, notre Philologue et Bascophile de Navarre, le Père Julio Zejador, est de la même opinion." Don J. G. Oregi, a priest at St. Sebastián, formerly professor of Heuskarian in the Instituto de Gipuskoa wrote as follows: "Mucho me alegro de la publicacion del Genesis y Exodo de d'Urte." It was from him that I learned in 1887 that the d'Urte MSS existed. Yet at least one Bask priest, the Curé of Ahetze, burned the small edition of the Genesis! The defects of the translation suggest that the author was ignorant of natural history and weak at genealogies, that it was made in extreme old age, when he was already partly deaf and blind; that it was made under dictation, and written down from dictation, and never finally revised by d'Urte himself. As Roger Bieston says: "In Genesis written, the *matier* evident is". D'Urtes Baskish shews slight traces of the influence of the adjoining Gipuskoan dialect. His grammar bears the date 1712. It is the oldest surviving Baskish grammar written in the French language, but badly arranged. It was published in 1900, with many misprints, at Bagnères de Bigorre. Its editor knows very

¹ A Castilian idiom, 'pueblo', which in Baskish has acted in the opposite direction, giving to 'erri' = 'town', 'contry' the sense of 'people' or 'inhabitants of the town'.

little Baskish, and has never seen the original. In it d'Urte makes no allusion to his Biblical translation. This fact probably shews that this was made later. The translation escaped the notice of the compilers of "The Bible of Every Land" (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons), which has a preface dated 1860, the very year when the library at Shirburn Castle was catalogized.¹ D'Urtes version can hardly be considered a theological question, except as adding to our catalogs under the heading 'Genesis'. One might look for the controversial bearing of his rendering of Gen. c. 3, v. 15, where Calvin has: "Et je mettrai de l'inimitié entre toi et la femme, entre ta semence et la semence de la femme: cette 'semence' te brisera la tête, et tu lui briseras le talon": d'Urte puts: "Eta eçarrico diat etssaitassuna hire eta Emaztearen artean, hire haciaren eta Emaztearen haciaren artean: haren haciac lehertuco daroc hiri burua eta hic lehertuco dioc hari thalogna." In this 'haren' means 'her'; 'haciac' is 'the seed' in the active case, and 'hari' translates 'lui', which grammatically may mean 'to him' or 'to her'. The context would make this pronoun refer here to 'the seed'. Duvoisin in this verse, of course, follows the Romish interpretation. Owing to the neutrality of Heuskarian pronouns, d'Urte is here as impartial as the original Hebrew. His translation is good seed for Papists and Protestants alike. I had to satisfy the Secretary of the Trinitarian Bible Society upon this head, before he would undertake the reprint of Etórkia.

NOTANDA.

I. VARIATIONS IN SPELLING. G. c. 14, v. 3 'Siddingo', but vv. 8 and 10 rightly 'Siddingo'. G. c. 14, v. 11. 'Guci' and 'Guzti' are the same, and mean 'all'. G. c. 16, vv. 1 and 3. 'Eiiptuarra' is the equivalent of 'Ejipciarra'. D'Urte spelt 'Ejiptu' or 'Eiiptu' as a rule. But I think in one or two places he used the 'g'.

Harismendi p. 57, and Materre p. 333 and 359 put a 'g' into it. G. c. 17, summary, 'yende' becomes in verse 27, 'jende', elsewhere 'iende'. G. c. 19, v. 24 'uri' = 'rain' is now generally spelt 'euri', but one hears 'uri' sometimes, e. g. at Ibarra sur Nivelle. Harismendi p. 93 has 'vrioc' = 'you rains there'. 'Uri' also means 'town', 'village'. Perhaps 'Eugi' in Navarra comes from 'euri' = 'uri'. G. c. 19, v. 27; c. 20, v. 8; c. 21, v. 14; c. 31, v. 55 we find 'goiz',

¹ It needs no arguing to shew that 'cataloguing' is a barbarous word. 'Cataloging' would be better.

but 'goiç' is d'Urtes general spelling. In means 'rising' (of the sun), 'morn', 'early'. G. c. 19, vv. 33, 34, 35 'etçan' and 'etcin' are used as mere variants. Señor F. de Arrese ta Beitia, poet and carpenter of Ochandiano in Biscaya, told me that the former means to 'lie face downwards' and the latter to 'lie on ones back'. The distinction is as fanciful as that of Canon Inchauspe who has written that the directive case-ending 'ra' = 'to', 'into' is used when mere motion 'towards' is implied, and its equivalent 'rát' when 'staying in the position reached' is intended. Over-definition is sometimes as dangerous as utter vagueness. Let the old authors decide! Harismendi p. 150, has 'etcite' for 'setting' of the sun and 'etcin oherat' = 'go to bed'. Materre, p. 323, has 'etcin çaité' = 'lie thou down into bed'. G. c. 22, v. 2. 'bakhótcha' and v. 12 'bakhoitça' both translate 'unique'. G. c. 26 'Abimelequec' is also written 'Abimelecquec'.

G. c. 48, 16. 'Isaquen', but generally 'Isaaquen' = 'of Isaac'.

G. cc. 49 and 50. The 'm' final of 'Ephraim' is turned into 'n' in the oblique cases. The same thing happens with that of 'Abraham'. 'Abrahan' occurs as a nominative c. 17, 7. The name of 'Adam' remains unchanged. In Duvoisins Labourdin version, made from the Latin of the Vulgate edition, 'Adam' and 'Abraham' preserve their 'm' in all cases. Harismendi has 'Abrahani' p. 105; but 'Abrahami' p. 163.

G. c. 36, vv. 2 and 14 there is 'gtipia', but elsewhere correctly 'ttipi'. It is pronounced 'chipi'. 'Philistindar' and 'Philistintar' occur as variants. The former shewing the 't' mutated after 'n' is the more correct. D'Urtes use of 'ar', 'dar', 'tar' is remarkable. It means not merely belonging to such and such a 'place', as in 'Egiptuar', but to a 'tribe', as in the above word and 'Hebrear', 'Ismaelitar', 'Israeltar' etc. It probably is the same ending that we have in 'indar' = 'strength' = 'wont to do', 'senar' = 'child-lover' = 'husband' etc., meaning originally 'fond of', 'apt to'.

From ch. 40 onwards 'quien' is frequently used instead of 'quign' = 'kiñ' as the copulative or unitive case-ending, meaning 'with'; e. g. c. 45, v. 1; c. 46, vv. 1 and 6; c. 47, v. 1, 'guciequien'; c. 49, v. 30 'larrearequien'; c. 50, v. 14, 'harequien'; c. 46, v. 7, 'berequien'; c. 43, v. 5, 'çuéquien'; vv. 8 and 16, 'enequien'; c. 44, v. 6, 'gurequien'; v. 14, 'anajequien'; but c. 42, v. 4, 'anajequign', and Ex: c. 4. summary 'batéquien'.

D'Urte perhaps follows some phonetic instinct in distinguishing 'n' from 'ñ' as a final letter. Ex: c. 4, v. 10, 'guerostic' is generally spelt 'gueroztic' = 'since'.

2. CASTILIANISMS. If Pierre d'Urte used too many words taken from the 'Erdara'¹ or 'Romance' without any need, the same may be said of all Bask writers. His native place, 'Donibane Lohizun' (= marshy St. John) was so important a station on the road from Spain to Bordeaux that it had an hospice for those who went on pilgrimage to St. Jacques of Compostela, and the high street of Berriz in Biscaya was called 'calle de San Juan de Luz'. Those who know Castilian will detect its influence throughout d'Urtes translation. Only a few specimens are noted here. G. c. 8, summary 'estatua' is not Castilian, but Latin 'statu' with a euphonic 'e' and the Baskish article 'a'. G. c. 24, v. 5, 'sin falta'.

G. c. 26, v. 22, 'largóän', where Duvoisin rightly put 'zabalera'.

G. c. 32, v. 12, 'podore' from 'poder' is perhaps a 'lapsus calami', or a local variety on the analogy of 'dolore' or 'ohore' = 'honor'.

G. c. 43, v. 9, and c. 44, v. 32, 'cauçione errendatçen' or 'errendatu' is a Castilian rendering of 'répondre'.

G. c. 38, v. 14, 'belo' and 'habituac'; G. c. 32, summary, 'arribada'.

Ex: c. 12, vv. 41 and 51, 'egun proprio hartan' ought to be, as we may see, Ex: c. 19, v. 1, 'egun hartan berean' = 'en ce même jour-là'. In the first place Calvins words 'en ce propre jour-là' have been too nearly followed.

Ex: c. 13, v. 17, and c. 19, v. 22 'perbentura' has not even its equal in the French.

Ex: c. 13, v. 21, 'coluna' instead of the native 'habe' (? Latin 'abies') which is used by writers of the first rank such as Dechepare, Harismendi, Capánaga, Larramendi shews at least the Bask dislike of 'mn'.

¹ 'Erdara' means the 'language' spoken by the neighbors of the Basks, e. g. Béarnais, Gascon, French and Castilian. It is perhaps derived from 'eritarra' = 'indigenous', 'belonging to the land', 'native', 'dweller in', 'landsman'. Harismendi on p. 151 used it in this sense, spelling it 'hertar', from which 'erdara' is the definite form in the old spelling of 'r' for 'rr'. If so, this points back to a time when the Vascongados (i. e. Vascon-ic-ati) found themselves newcomers among a native population which spoke a language different from their own. To the French in Madagascar, for instance, the most important *forane* tongue is that of the 'interior' of the island, that of the 'natives'. Goyhetché in his 'Fabliac' p. 259, uses 'erdara' apparently in the sense of 'language' in general: "Suge malurusac aldiz bere erdaran ahal beçain molde onean baderro" = 'the wretched serpent in turn says to him in his "erdara", in as good form as he can'. This shews that the Basks used it contemptuously at least in former times.

Ex: c. 14, v. 30, the word 'descantssatu' = Castilian 'descansado' in the sense of 'aid', 'deliver' is a bad specimen of degenerate 'erdarism'.

Ex: c. 15, v. 3, 'balent' for 'valiant', instead of 'bihotzdun' or 'indartsu'. v. 8, 'curri' for 'running' waters. 'Laster-egin' is the word for 'run'.

Ex: c. 21, v. 13, 'guardian' = 'on the look out for', 'on guard', would be better turned by 'begira'.

Ex: c. 21, v. 8 'desloialqui comportatcen' = 'être perfide'; v. 28, 'lapidatu' and 'quito' are very weak.

Ex: c. 25, v. 4 'etchatu' for 'jetté' from Castilian 'echar' is abject. D'Urte or his amanuensis put a great many superfluous dots over his vowels, presumably to prevent Gallicism in pronunciation. He imitated the oldest Baskish song, and the oldest Baskish letter, in putting them over the letter 'y'. The same peculiarity occurs in the famous English epitaph of Earl Richard Beauchamp (about A. D. 1445) in the collegiate church of Warwick. It is noticeable in the MS, and the Oxford edition, that some words meant to be catchwords are placed so as not to fulfil their purpose. They look like vain repetitions in perusing the text.

Among d'Urtes Gallicisms 'banquet' and 'bouquet' are conspicuous. Leizarraga also used 'banquet'.

3. WORDS AND PHRASES OF LINGUISTIC INTEREST. 'Ethór-quüä', the word used by d'Urte to translate the Greek Genesis, in G. c. 2, v. 4, 'generation', is still in use. It is of course the best word. Duvoisin in his translation in the same dialect renders it by the uneyeable bastard 'Jenesa'! But Uriarte has 'Genesisco', equally bad. 'Etórkia', as it is now spelled, may be found in various books of the 17th and 18th centuries, e. g. in the 'Dotrina Christiana' or 'Catechism' of Esteve Materre (Bordeaux, 1617 and 1623) of which the Bodleian Library provides the only copy known. There, on page 64, it means the 'proceeding' of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, as defined by St. Athanasios. On p. 162 it occurs in the phrase: "ceren nola Adamec becatu eguin çuenean likistu eta nothatu baitçuen bere ethorquia eta naturaleça", i. e. "for as Adam, when he did sin, did defile and brand his 'origin' and nature." Sebastian Mendiburu used it too. Page XIX Mr. Thomas has an interesting note on 'orkaitz'. The word probably comes from the Latin 'furca' like 'ondo' from Latin 'fundo' or 'fundum'. If so it is to be likened psychologically to the German 'gabel-bock', or 'fork-goat', i. e. 'young deer'.

G. c. 1, v. 11, 'egozkia' stands for French 'jet'. For this word see 'giet' in Godefroys Dictionary of Old French. Monsieur H. L. Fabre in his French-Baskish Dictionary translates 'suçon' by 'egóskia'. Is it of the same root as 'eguskia', 'iguskia' = 'the sun' i. e. 'the cauldron', or 'boiling instrument' or 'matter', of the Universe from 'egosi' = 'boiled'; or as 'egotzi' = 'thrown out', 'gegossen'? G. c. 2, v. 23, 'guiçonquia' perhaps shews that d'Urte thought of English 'woman' which obviously suggests 'man'. 'Emasteki' is known as a synonym of 'emazte' the ordinary word for 'woman'. By analogy therefore 'gizonki', which is not in Larramendi, ought to be a synonym of 'gizon' = 'man'. For the termination 'qui' = 'ki' see p. 14, v. 13 'estalki' = 'material for covering'; f. 90, v. 27, 'arrapaki' and 'atze-manki' = 'material caught and taken'; f. 12, v. 14 'herrestaki' = 'thing that creepeth', and other words in d'Urtes text.

G. c. 2, v. 11. The expression 'sortcen baita urrea' is poetical and true to nature; "the gold is born." 'Sorte inuenitur aurum'.

G. c. 3, v. 11, 'jatera' is perhaps a miswriting of 'jatea', and so the accusative of 'bainaroen'.

G. c. 7, v. 11, and 8, v. 2. 'Tapac' renders the French 'bondes', and the English 'windows'. Littré explains 'bonde' as "Large ouverture de fond, destinée à laisser écouler toute l'eau de l'étang quand on retire le tampon qui la bouche ordinairement." D. Martin in his French Bible of 1707 has a note to the same effect. The Greek and Latin translations have 'cataracts', which in 'Heuskara'¹ would be 'urjaiotsak', 'ataskak', 'eurijasak', 'ekachak', 'ekaitzak'. D'Urte uses 'tapatu', the past participle, in c. 26, vv. 15 and 18, where St. Jerome has 'obstruere'. This points to Castilian 'tapa' = 'lid', 'cover', 'stopper', 'cork', 'bouchon', 'propfe'. In Catalan this is 'tap'. D'Urte may have even thought of English 'taps'. But the idea of 'uncorking', 'untapping', or 'tapping' the heavens to produce the universal flood is unworthy of the Aeschylean sublimity of the Egyptian sage.

¹ The Baskish tongue is called by the Basks themselves 'Heuskara', 'Heskuara', 'Euskara', 'Euskera', 'Uskara', 'Eskara', etc. at different epochs and in different dialects. Some people explain it as meaning 'hitz-kerá' = 'manner of word', 'mund-art'. Sir Thomas Browne, who studied the language in the reign of King Charles II, called it 'Basquish'. It is best to follow his example, and to reserve 'Bask' as the name of the 'Heuskaldunak' or 'Baskish-holders' as the Basks call themselves. But, as 'Basquish' is liable to be pronounced as a rime to 'vanquish', I venture to spell it 'Baskish' on the German model, to suit Finnish, Turkish, Swedish, etc.

G. c. 7, v. 6, 'ur uholdea', if it be not a miswriting of 'uru-holdea', shews that Baskish as known to d'Urtes people was obliged to say 'the water-flood of water', instead of simply 'the flood of water'. They must have been unable to conceive of 'a flood' separated from the notion of 'water'. And in truth we seldom hear of floods produced by any other liquid. The etymology of 'uholde' gives us its initial 'u' as a mere compositional form of 'ur' = 'water'. Then the word became so far a generic term that it did not seem absurd to use it with 'ur' as the constitutive or genitival radical to shew that the flood was an inundation of water. It was in fact a making of the waters to stand upon a heap, a carrying of sea coal to Newcastle. It recalls the habitual use in Portuguese of 'uma chavena de cha' = 'a teacup of tea'! There 'the teacup', at first a proper noun, became so far a generic term = 'cup' or 'taza' that its own 'etymon' could be used again as a limiting, specific, or qualifying noun-adjective. In the same way d'Urte has 'ur-ithurriak' = 'water-springs' on f. 38, v^o v. 13, f. 40, v. 43; and f. 38, v^o v. 11 'ur-phutçu' = 'water-well'. It is to be compared with the name of the river 'Uru-mea', once 'Guru-mea', at San Sebastián, meaning apparently 'the shallow-water'. The name of Lake 'Urumiya' in Persia is pronounced like that of the Gipuskoan river. For 'e' before 'a' final in Baskish sounds like English 'e' in 'he'. Blackies Modern Cyclopaedia (1890) says of that inland sea: "It is extremely shallow throughout." The second 'u' in 'Urumea' is generally explained as an euphonic link. It is not likely that it was once an integral part of the word 'hur', 'ur' = 'water'. Cf. 'zur-u-bi' = 'zurbi'. G. c. 7, v. 13 'bajta' and c. 12, v. 17 'baÿta' are rather Gipuskoan than Labourdin. The latter dialect usually has 'baieta' = 'yea also'.

G. c. 11, v. 4. Where the French has 'soit', in Italic, and the Jacobean English of 1611 "may reach", d'Urte ought to have put the Subjunctive 'den' instead of the Imperative 'içan bedi', though this is not untranslatable if taken to mean "and a tower, of the which let the point be up to heaven."

G. c. 12, v. 10. The now famous use of 'emaztebat' = 'une femme' instead of 'une famine', points to confusion between these expressions in the authors mind; and is alone enough to warrant the conjecture that the translation was made as I have suggested above. After being a Capuchin monk he seems to have made much of women! Not only was he married twice and had a daughter, but he gives a capital initial to 'Alaba' = 'the daughter'

and 'Emaztea' and 'Emea' = 'the woman'. On p. 228 of *La Revue de Linguistique*, Tome 30, we read "Meeting October 10, 1719. That Peter d'Urte is married without the consent of the Commissioners, for which he was excluded in the last distribution, since which he is gone off with his daughter by a former wife." So his 'femme' in very truth possibly came as a synonym of 'famine' to him, as a 'gossete urthe' = 'famine year' (G. c. 14, v. 27), or 'gosse d'Urte' = hungry d'Urte "Ta feme moir ny croutyn." (E. Faragher, p. 70 of *Aesops Fables in Manx*, Douglas 1901). Necessity is the mother of invention.

G. c. 14, v. 11; and 43, vv. 20 and 22 'ianhari' means 'victuals'. In G. c. 44, vv. 1 and 4 'ianhari naussia' = 'the victuals-master', just as c. 40, v. 1, 'ogui-jabe' = 'bread-master', i. e. 'baker'; and in v. 2, 'ogui-iabe naussia' = 'the chief baker', the master baker.

G. c. 14, v. 23, 'hiré diren gäuça guçietaric' gives us the possessive case or adjective used indefinitely. Other instances occur; e. g. c. 12, v. 20, 'eta haren çiren gauça guçiac'; c. 46, v. 1 'bere çituen gauça guçiequien', v. 10 'eta hire diren gauça guçiac'.

G. c. 18, v. 16; and Ex: c. 16, v. 16, 'Neurri' is used rightly in its proper sense as 'measure', but on ff. 75, 84, 85, 86, 129 it is used for 'nourrir' though 'entretenitu' is more correctly used to mean this elsewhere. 'Hazi' is of course the word that d'Urte should have used, one of the links, perhaps, between Keltic and Baskish. As 'ideas,' 'seed' and 'nourishment' are 'the beginning' of all conceptions of organic life¹ 'Neurri,' probably derived from the Béarnais language, was used also by Haraneder in the sense of 'nourish': e. g. in 'Gudu Izpirituala' (1750) pp. 279 and 286; and by Goyhetché, Curé of Urruña and uncle of Pierre Goyetche, Maire of Sara, on p. 277 of his badly punctuated translation of the 'Fables' of Lafontaine, an interesting work in which he was assisted by M. le Chanoine Maurice Harriet, of Halzu, who is still living. It is a curious coincidence that 'mezur' means 'nourriture' in Breton.

G. c. 19, v. 27, between 'eta' and 'lekhura' some words such as 'igan çen' or 'ioan çen' seem to have been left out in the MS. The French is 'vint au lieu'.

G. c. 22, v. 10, 'cintçurrac egiteco', literally 'to do the throats'

¹ See Pliny, and Professor J. Rhys in *Lectures on Welsh Philology*. Professor Rhys wrote to me on the 21st of December, 1891, "I have long since spotted Pliny's ponies. What you say about Basque *azi* and the Alpine *asia* is very interesting."

= 'to cut the throat'. The expression perhaps comes from the Béarnais. On p. 22 of "Quelques Légendes Poétiques du Pays de Soule" by Jean de Jaurgain, one finds "de quoi le chrestiaa (cagot) de Tardets *ly fe las gorges*," where the last words in Italic, mean "cut (lit. did) his 'throats', i. e. 'throat'."

G. c. 24, v. 3, 'iuramentu eraguignen'; Ex: c. 9, v. 18 'uria eraguitera nihoac' = 'je m'en vais faire pleuvoir'; and v. 20 'ihes eraguin çioten etçhetara haren çerbitçariey eta haren bestiey', where it governs a dative, the French being 'fit promptement retirer dans les maisons ses serviteurs et ses bêtes', are places in which 'eragin' = 'to make to do, to cause to make' is used in its normal sense as the causative form of 'egin'. But we find it in d'Urte usurping the functions of 'eraci' = 'to cause' e. g. G. c. 36, v. 24; and c. 37, v. 2 'ianeraguin' = 'to make to make to eat'; G. c. 37, vv. 12, 13, 16 and passim 'basceraçguiten' (sic for 'bazqueraçguiten') 'to cause to make to feed', and there it is peculiar, probably a solecism. In G. c. 29, v. 8 'edara' is rightly used for 'abbreuer' = 'to make to drink'.

G. c. 24, v. 43. The construction 'ur chorta bat' = 'a drop of water' seems the most rational but f. 26, v. 7 'ithurri ur' = 'fount (of) water' is more in accordance with the modern usage for the position of the radical indicating contents or constituents. Cf. 'ur phutçu' above, and 'ur-uholde'.

G. c. 24, v. 44. The use of the active form of the vocative of the pronoun of the 2nd person in 'edantçac hic' is interesting. Leizarraga also uses it.¹ But the rule does not appear to be fixed. The vocative can be passive even with the imperative of an active verb, e. g. f. 37, v. 9, and f. 47, v. 27. In G. c. 27, v. 26, we see it so used: 'eta mussu emadac, ene sêmeä'. We see it also passive with the 2nd person singular of an active verb in the indicative mood, thus G. c. 38, v. 29, 'heürriori' following 'eguin dioan.' Also in Ex: c. 4, v. 13, 'helas Iauna! egortçac', it is passive with the imperative and in c. 5, v. 22, with the indicative, as follows: 'Iauna, cergatican gaizqui trataraci duc poblu hau'?

G. c. 25, summary, 'ema ohe lagunen', and v. 6, 'ema oheco lagunen' are remarkable words meaning 'bed-fellow female'.

¹ Professor W. I. Knapp, whom I had the pleasure of meeting in Oxford in October 1901, possessed a perfect copy which is not mentioned in Professor J. Vinsons Bibliographie Basque, of this authors Baskish New Testament of 1571, republished in 1900 at Strassburg in Elsass. He sold it to Mr. Archer M. Huntington, Westchester County, State of New York. A third edition is to be published in London by the Trinitarian Bible Society in 1903.

G. c. 25, v. 18; c. 27, v. 23, and c. 9, v. 15, 'anaia bat', are places shewing that d'Urte treated 'anaia' not 'anai' as the radical form of the Heuskarian word for 'brother'. Christophe Harismendi did the same e. g. pages 21 and 24 of 'Ama Virginaren Hirur Officioac' (Bordeaux, 1660) in the Labourdin dialect.¹ Cf. G. c. 2, v. 10, 'ibaia bat': Ex: c. 22, summary 16, 'birjina bat'. In modern authors the etymological 'a' final of nouns is sometimes confounded with the definite article and treated as separable. This is robbery. D'Urte used 'besti' so.

G. c. 25, v. 25, and c. 30, v. 40, 'gorricara' is for 'roux'. In G. c. 25, v. 30, 'de ce roux-là' is translated 'horraco errequi hortaric (erreki = burnt or roasted matter)'.

G. c. 27, vv. 26 and 28. In 'baitut' one sees 'bai' used for 'ba' as the conditional. This is probably an error, though not unknown in other authors. In v. 21 etc., the true form 'ba-da' preceded by 'baldim' is found, and not 'baita' which would be right if 'bai' could be a conditional prefix.

G. c. 28, v. 12, 'ukitzen', which usually means 'touching', is used in the sense of 'reaching up to' heaven. In G. c. 27, v. 21, it stands for 'tâter'. Gen. c. 25, v. 22 he has 'alegueratcen' meaning 'sporting', 'rejoicing', 'making merry'. This is an eccentric rendering of *ἐσκήπτων* in the Greek of the Septuagint, and savours of 'saltabant' or 'exultabant' more than of 'collidebantur', the third variant found in the Vulgate editions. Duvoisin has 'gudukatzen' = 'fighting'. The versions in Calvins French of the 16th century and that of 1707 have "s'entrepoussoyent" but the Castilian of F. T. Amat (Madrid, 1832) has 'chocaban entre si ó luchaban', while the French version of E. Reuss gives "s'entrechoquaient". Can d'Urte have mistaken the sense and thought of 'jocose'?

G. c. 28, v. 21. Mr. Llewelyn Thomas asked me to find an instance of this form in French 'Heuskara'. I have seen it elsewhere. M. J. Vinson omits it in his Appendix.

¹ The title means 'The Three Offices of the Virgin Mother'. It is not merely a liturgical curiosity, but a valuable literary landmark. I had just received news of the publication of M. J. Vinsons avowedly incomplete, and demonstrably ill-printed, edition, when Bodleys Librarian let me know (30 Sept. 1901) that the University of Oxford owns the only known perfect copy. It consists of 236 pages, and formed part (Maresch. 439) of the Library of T. Marshall, Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford who died there in 1685. His epitaph may be read on the pavement of the chancel of the adjoining church of All Saints. See Notes and Queries for 9 November, 1901.

G. c. 30, v. 13. 'ils diront' becomes 'erraungo' for 'erranen' with a superfluous 'go', perhaps a solecism.

G. c. 30, v. 35. 'çhuri non ere baitçiren guçiac' = "toutes celles ou il y avoit du blanc," is literally "all who were in any place whatever white."

G. c. 33, v. 8, 'edirecotçat', and Ex. c. 6, v. 13, 'atheratçecôtçat' are interesting as shewing the case ending 'tzat' piled upon another 'co', of practically the same force. It is the equivalent of English 'for to'.

G. c. 33, v. 16. 'appaisé' is rendered 'esmaratu. Is this a common word? Is it derived from the Latin 'ex' and 'mare' as if referring to a sea that is 'un-sea-ed'? or from Castilian 'esmerar' or 'esbarar'? John Stevens, in his Castilian-English Dictionary of 1706, translates 'esbarar' by 'to glide' or 'slip along'. The Basks might have taken the word in the sense of 'make' or 'become smooth and peaceful'. The change of 'b' into 'm' is common. The English equivalent is 'pleased'. The LXX have εὐδοκῆσεις με. The Welsh 'ammori' is not unlike it in form and meaning. In 'hec hill içatu eta, eta pillatu çuten hiria', G. c. 34, v. 27, we have a notable case of 'eta' = 'after' ('that'), followed by 'eta' = 'and'.

G. c. 35, v. 14. The French 'aspersion' is rendered 'ihinztur' perhaps a solecism, derived from 'ihinz' = 'dew'. Aizkibel does not imbook this word, but 'intz-emaillea' = 'aspersorio', literally 'the dew-giver'. The English Jacobean version has 'drink-offering'.

G. c. 37, v. 4. This case of the negative and the affirmative potential sub-auxiliaries 'ecin' and 'ahal' used in one clause, but yet not annihilating each other, is not unique in Baskish literature, but worthy of note.

G. c. 37, v. 5. 'abilla' = 'goest thou?' is perhaps the only occurrence in this book of the interrogative sign used with verbal forms, i. e. 'a' final.

G. c. 37, v. 8. 'baldim bahintç?' as a simple interrogative, and not a conditional, is remarkable. I treated 'baldim' as a slip of the pen and omitted it in the 2nd edition.

G. c. 40, v. 14. 'gogara' for 'gogora' occurs elsewhere in d'Urte and other writers.

G. c. 40, v. 19, etc. The use of 'çur' = 'zur' in the sense of 'tree' is very interesting. Leizarraga in his New Testament (1571, and 1900) uses it in the same way, e. g. Acts c. 13, v. 19; c. 5, v.

30; c. 10, v. 40 of the 'lignum crucis'. It generally means 'wood', ὕλη, that has been felled at least, if not cut up. It may be as near a relative to Latin 'suber' as it is to Baskish 'su' = 'fire', which d'Urte articulates 'suba', e. g. G. c. 19, v. 24. In Cataluña, e. g. in the contry named after 'Ruscino' from Keltic 'ruskin' = 'bark' which always was its principal product, cork-trees are called 'suros', and their 'wood' much used for 'fires'. R. Micoleta (or Nicoleta?) in his manuscript dated 1653, published for the third time in 1897, at Sevilla, renders it by 'viga' = 'beam'. 'Suriya' is the name of a particular tree in Ceylon. Baskish 'zurea' = 'the tree' and 'zuria' = 'the white' is pronounced like this. There are some places in modern Baskish, 'Souraide' = 'wood-air', or 'wood-fellow' for instance, which have this word in the etymology of their names, and it probably explains that of the village of 'Soure' in Portugal, famous for its store of timber stacks, on the edge of a vast primeval pine-forest, and that of 'Soria' in Spain, and possibly 'Zoria' in Greece, also. 'Zuria', in the Province of Barcelona, is on the border of an immense pine-forest. Voltaire has 'sur' in the sense of 'fire'. The Gipuskoans sometimes say 'surtan' for "in the fire." 'Surtu' means 'afervorizarse'. In Icelandic 'fyri' = both 'fire' and 'fir-tree'. Some one has proposed that the 'Suburra' of Rome came from 'zur-bi-buru-a', which is the name of several places and one parish in the Pays Basque, meaning 'bridge-head', 'bridge-end', from 'zur-bi' or 'zu-bi' = 'bridge', formed of 'zur' = 'bit of wood', 'plank,' and 'bi' = 'two'. Who has not seen rustic bridges thus made in the Pyrenean valleys? 'Zuru-bi' = 'ladder' (G. c. 28, v. 12) is the same word. The Japanese too look at a 'ladder' and a 'bridge' from the same point of view. 'Sybaris' might well be derived from 'su' = 'fire' and 'barri' = 'new', if one remembers the tradition of 'the fire' inaugurating the infant colonies of the Greeks, such as 'Cumae', the name of which is like Baskish 'kume', 'hume', = 'child'. Baskish is rich in words for 'tree'. Harismendi uses, p. 98, 'zuhaitz', and pp. 103 and 131 'zuhaitz landarea' (= 'sapling'), and p. 94 'çuhamuic' probably for 'zuhaumeoc'. This last was also used by B. Dechepare.

G. c. 41 Calvins 'jeune vache' is rendered quite wrongly 'jeune veau'. But in v. 26 the Baskish drops the equivalent of 'jeune'. 'Chahal' or 'chaal' is 'calf', 'becerro' in the modern language, everywhere from Bilbao to Bayonne, from Pamplona to San Sebastián. D'Urte renders the words "et des vaches qui allaient"

in G. c. 33, v. 13 by 'eta chahal esnecumedunez', meaning literally 'and with calves that-have-milk-children'. Here his mistake seems all the more silly; talking about a calf that has a sucking young one! In other places we see that he was not clever at natural history. Duvoisin rightly renders 'vache' by 'behi' = 'cow'. This word may be of Gothic origin, akin to 'faihu' and German 'vieh'.

G. c. 41, v. 38, 'ahal giñezake is a case of the potential pleonasm occasionally used by other writers, even Leizarraga; to be able to be able! So also Ex. c. 7, v. 24, 'eta eçign edan baitçeçaquéten ibayeco uretican'. Ignorant Englishmen sometimes say "can be able."

G. c. 41, v. 47 "abundantcia iraun demboran" = 'during the time (of) the lasting (of) abundance' is a very English stringing together of radicals.

G. c. 42, v. 7. 'aleguia' is composed of 'ala' the interrogative prefix and 'eguiá' = 'the truth', in Castilian '¿es verdad?'

See Larramendi under 'montas'. It does not, however, mean 'equidem' here, but 'pretense' = 'pretext'. It is not of course 'alegia' = 'granary' or 'grain-land, which is the name of some places in Spanish Baskland, converted by the Castilians into 'Alegria' = 'joy'!

G. c. 42, v. 16, 'Espioneac çaretela' gives an instance of what I call "la Béarnais," because 'la' in this Baskish idiom has no more apparent reason than the 'que' that precedes the verb in Béarnais, or in the Portuguese "Desde hontem á noite que tem caído chiuva miuda" = 'since last night ('over-night', 'yester-night', 'ante noctem') fine rain has been falling.'

G. c. 44, v. 18, 'orayderagno' = 'jusques à présent'. The 'de' = 're' appears superfluous here, cf. 'Noereragno' c. 5, summary.

G. c. 44, v. 31, 'car tu es comme Pharaon' has been amplified into 'ecen ezaiz Pharaon bagno guehiago ez gutiago' = "for thou art not more nor less than Pharaoh."

G. c. 45, v. 22, 'cilharra' at once recalls English 'silver'. It may be derived from 'Zilo' = 'hole' and 'arra' = 'belonging to'. A mine is a hole in the mountain, and silver is a mineral. There are villages in Spain where the people live in holes scooped out of sandstone strata. Such would be called 'Siluria' in Baskish = 'the town of holes', the name of a part of Britain.

Baskish 'uria' and 'hiria' = 'the town', possibly explains some place-names which occur in ancient Greek and Latin books. In

searching for an etymology in the mysterious darkness that enshrouds the origin of Baskish words, and the former wanderings of Basks before they enter into history, one thinks of Sanskrit 'puri', 'pur', Hebrew 'hir', Sumerian 'uru', Assyrian 'uri', Welsh 'hir', 'yr'. Possibly as a town is a 'vecindad' in Spain, the Baskish postposition 'iri-an' = 'nigh unto' may teach us what was the first concept of the word, not a watering-place or oasis in the desert; but a 'neighborhood'.

G. c. 47, vv. 17 and 18, the expressions 'ardi artaldeen', 'idi artaldeen', 'hacienda artáldeac' seem to suggest that 'art' in 'artalde' is not short for 'ardi' = 'sheep'; but for 'arta' = 'arreta' = 'care'. It would be as absurd to talk about 'sheep-folds of sheep', 'sheep-folds of oxen', 'sheep-folds of cattle', as of 'water-floods of water'. 'Talde', however, is possibly distinct from 'alde'.

G. c. 49, v. 17, 'erori' was at first 'eroritcen' apparently, or 'eroriren'. The scribe has altered it for the worse. In the English it is in the future. The French is 'afin que . . . tombe'. Ibidem the MS omits 'duc' after 'icango'. The editions have erred in not reinstating it.

Gen: c. 49, v. 26. 'aldaquen' would be 'aldapen', in Gipuskoan. The word is not unknown at Cambo on the Nive. Perhaps it comes from Castilian 'falda' = 'slope'.

Ex: c. 2, v. 3, the word 'arrossategui', which can only mean "bed of roses", is incorrectly used where 'ihi-tegi' would be more suitable. D'Urte, with his evident ignorance of natural history, translated the French 'roseau' = 'seska', 'canabera', in too flowery a style! the English here has 'flags'; the Greek τὸ ἐλῶδες μέρος and ἐν τῇ ἑλει; the Latin 'carecto' and 'papyrione' the Castilian 'carrizal'. Larramendi gives 'ugarrizadi' for this last word.

Ex: c. 2, v. 5, 'Nescato' and 'nescatcha' appear as synonyms. This fact alone is enough to show that D. Pedro Novia de Salcedo (who knew very little Baskish, as his grand-daughters told me at Seville) was wrong when he stated in his Dictionary that 'nescato' is an 'augmentative'!

Ex. c. 3, v. 15, the French pronunciation of 'saeculorum' is recorded in the word 'seculorónecotç'.

One is surprised here and there at our authors violent use of the radical in the sense of the constitutive genitive where one would expect the 'mediative case', e. g. Ex. c. 48. v. 19, 'abundantcia bethea', 'abundance-full' instead of 'full of' or 'with abundance'. 'Abundantciaz' would seem more expectable. He seems

to use the accusative quite as often as the genitive for the object of the transitive verbal nouns. In French Baskish as a rule, the genitive is used, while the Gipuskoan Dialect affects the accusative. In old English too we find such phrases as "the shutting the door" instead of "of the door".

Ex: XI, v. 7, where Calvin has 'chien', d'Urte put 'ozar' = 'hound'. Mr. Thomas was told that this word is obsolete. I have myself used the word in Navarre and was understood. One finds it on p. 60 of 'Credo edo Sinhesten Dut' (Bayonne, 1891) a book in very good Labourdin, with whose author, Étienne Lapeyre, I have conversed, and in other modern books e. g. 'Misionetako Kantikak' (1892). It is a contraction of 'hora-zar' = 'old hound', or 'great' and 'terrible hound'.

The Abbé Chantre, ('Zubiburu-tarra') told me in the Petit Séminaire de Larresoro that 'chakur', the commonest word for 'dog', is derived from 'eche-ko hora' = 'chien de maison', 'house-dog'. Canon Harriet, of Halsou, rejects this on the ground that the 'r' in 'chakur' is doubled before the suffixes.

'Chakur' is probably from 'chainkor' = 'zainkor' = 'apt to watch'. 'Zainka' = 'to play the part of guardian', is used in the sense of 'to bark'. Others have connected it with 'chacal' an African wild dog.

On p. 110 of Lays of the Red Branch by Sir Samuel Ferguson, (London, MDCCCXCVII) this line occurs "A hound I saw, and heard him 'Ossar' called", and on the next this "Ossar! good dog, hie forth and chase the thieves!" As a Gaelic word 'osar' means "a bed, litter, a burden: the younger". This would not be so good a name for a dog as the Baskish word in question. Was it used as a dog-name in old Irish?

Ex: c. 13, vv. 12, 13, 15, the use of 'athea' = 'door-the' or 'womb-the' is probably a solecism in the language, and to be considered a 'mot savant', taken evidently from 'portiere', one of the meanings of which was 'matrice', as appears from the Dictionnaire de l'Ancienne Langue Française (Paris, 1889). In v. 12, it is used twice, translating first 'matrice' and then 'portiere'. In verses 13 and 15 it renders 'portiere'.

Ex: c. 14, v. 25, 'nequetç' is in favor of 'tz' being the old form of 'z' in such words as 'baietz' = 'di si, yesly'; 'ezetç' = 'noly'. So in Harismendi we find p. 82 'fitez', but pp. 47, 48, 94, and 158, etc. 'fítetz'; and p. 101, violatz' for 'violaz'. 'Itssass' in Ex: c. 14, v. 30; c. 15, v. 22, and Ex: c. 15, v. 4, 'itsass gorrian' = 'in

the red sea' is probably a miswriting of 'itsasso' which occurs in the foregoing verse. 'Itsass' as a radical meaning 'stick to', 'adhere', 'cleave to', 'Itsasso', which is pronounced with the article 'itsassua' is probably from 'itsass-ur'='sticky-water', which well describes the sea. 'Ura'='the water' is sometimes pronounced 'u-wa'. In Ex: c. 14, v. 30, however, we find 'itsass bazterrean'='on the sea-shore'. So too in Leizarragas classical New Testament, to be reprinted at the Clarendon Press in 1903, we find 'itsas' frequently, e. g. St. Matt. c. xv, v. 29 with 'alde'='sea-side', v. 25 with 'gainez'='on the top of the sea', and elsewhere with 'costa'='the sea-coast'. So possibly 'itsas' alone can mean 'sea'.

Ex: c. 16, v. 16, 'hedetchea'='the tent', is apparently a d'Urtian word. It means literally the 'strap-house', or 'the stretch-house', not a bad name.

Ex: c. 22. sum: 16. 'birjina bat çuritçen duena'='celui qui suborne une vierge'. The word 'çuri'='whiten', is used of 'stripping' the maize stalks in the 'artadiak'. Possibly it was the origin of 'chourineur' in the Parisian argot, a man who despoils others of their property and lives, and leaves them white.

D'Urtes accentual system differs a little from that of Leizarraga.

THE APPENDIX OF MONSIEUR JULIEN VINSON.

This part of the edition is almost useless. It does not even serve as an index, because it is not paginal, and leaves the reader to find for him or herself such forms of the verb as it enrolls. But it does not indicate all of these. It is incomplete. Worse still, its translations are in many places incorrect. It includes 'da' ('he', 'she' or 'it is'), but omits 'du' ('he', 'she' or 'it has him', 'her' or 'it'), which is no less rare.

'Aite' means not 'tu pourrais être', but 'tu seras'. 'Baituc' f. 29. verso, is not 'tu les as certes, ô homme', but 'si'l y a'. 'Cioät does not mean 'Je l'ai à toi, ô homme', but 'Je l'ai à lui ô homme'. 'Etciaçontçat', f. 67, v. 9, does not mean "pour qu'il ne l'aie" pas à lui," but 'pour qu'il ne l'eut pas à lui'. 'Eztiacacala' f. 34 is not 'qu'il ne l'ait pas à lui ô homme', but 'qu'il ne l'ait pas à toi ô homme'. 'Guiâtezquec' is not 'nous ne pouvons pas l'avoir ô homme', but 'nous pouvons être ô homme'. 'Uque', f. 65, is not 'tu l'aurais' but 'tu l'auras'. There are other mistakes for which the printer is not to blame. Those who know a little Baskish will easily find them out. Why

does M. Vinson say "pour mieux expliquer certains auxiliaires dont la signification originale nous échappe, j'ai cru pouvoir me servir des verbes 'avoir' et 'être' que j'ai mis entre parenthèses"? It is true that for us the origin of the Baskish verb has to be sought in the 16th century. The earlier Basks must be blamed for not recording their language. But every Heuskaldun baby knows that these 'auxiliaries' are 'the Verb'; and that, when used in the absolute, their proper meaning is 'to have' and 'to be' respectively. 'Izan' can mean either! The context tells one which. We may compare this with the vulgar English 'aint' which means 'am not', 'have not', 'is not', 'has not', 'are not'. And there are other languages which have awkward homonyms in their verb. For instance Irish 'ata' translates 'am', 'art', 'is', 'are'; and 'nil' the negative of each of these. (See Simple Lessons in Irish by E. O'Growney, part 1, pp. 13, 22, edition of 1897.) 'Nik dut adatsa' means 'I have the head of hair'; but 'nik dut egiten odia' means 'I am making the channel' (literally: 'I have the channel a-making', 'in making').

So also 'tirtotcha da' means 'it is the cork',¹ while 'alashia erorten-da' means the 'plate-rack is a-falling', 'in falling', i. e. 'falling'. Why produce confusion where all is plain? 'The Verb' in the Heuskarian tongue is 'to be', 'to have', whether simply, or acting through a be-verbed radical, which shews 'how' the being and having are manifested, and determines the relation between the subject and its object or predicate. All Basks know that 'bait', 'beit', 'bai', 'bei', 'ba'² do often mean, as M. Vinson says, 'par ce que', though Dartayeta in his useful Guide ou Manuel de la Conversation &c. (1861, 1876 and 1893) may have been the first lexicologist or grammarian to mention this use of the affirmative prefix. It probably takes this sense as the 'locum-tenens' of some such word as 'Zeren' which formerly preceded it, but has retired from service. It is often capable of being rendered by 'since', 'that is to say', 'and in consequence', 'so that', 'to explain why', or even by the relative pronoun, as

¹ This word appears as 'Tortitça' in an edition of Voltoires 'Trésor' which was added to the 'Bibliothèque de Bayonne' in 1895. Larramendi on p. 92 of his Dictionary wrote under the heading 'arbol': "Elsudor, o humedad que suda el arbol, 'tortica'" The latter is probably a misprint for 'tortitça' = 'tortitça'.

² The 'b' becomes 'p' after the negative prefix 'es', which reminds one, when so fused, of Portuguese 'nanja' = 'nonjam'.

on p. 245, of a carelessly written volume entitled "Bihotz Sacratua-ren Hilabetheco Escu-Liburua A. Basilio Joanna-teguy Benedic-tanoac Escuaraz ezarria, Lasserre, liburu egilea baitan" (Bay-onne, 1894) where 'ethorrico zaio eguna jautsico baita' means 'the day will come to him in which he will come down'. M. Vinson would translate the last two words 'because he is to come down'. Cases are even known where it is used as a substitute for the conjunctive suffix 'la' meaning 'that'; e. g. in Dechepares 'Rimes' (Bordeaux, 1545), the oldest known Baskish book, the line 'Amorosac nahi nuque honat veba valite' = I should wish (it) 'that' the amorous 'would look to this'; and in the above-named book, p. 36, 'nahi ginuke giristino guziek ohoratzen balute' = 'we should desire (it) that all Christians would honour (it)'. In the 'Dotrinea' of Martin Ochoa de Capánaga, p. 103 of the editions of 1656 and 1893 'deseandola (la ocasion de pecar) de nuevo' is translated 'ostera baleuco deseetan dabela' where the Baskish can only mean "desiring 'that' he should have it back again" equivalent to "desiring it, if he should have it again". E. Materre p. 309 has 'eta nahi nuque huni iarrai qui bacenenquitça' = 'and I would desire (it) if you would follow him.' In Capánaga again, p. 105 the meaning of 'edo gura leuqueala amesetan etorri balequioz alaaco gauçaac . . . alan içan baliz gura leuquiola' is "or desiring 'that' such things should happen to him in dreams, . . . desiring 'that' it should be so." Also in Voltoires 'Trésor', p. 84, "Nahi nuke har baziniessa" means "I should wish (it) 'that' you would take (it) for me". In all these cases, where it will be noticed that the ruling verb-word means 'desire', i. e. 'nahi', 'gura' 'deseetan', it might be argued that 'ba' is still conditional, the sense being "if all Christians would honour it, we should desire (it)"; "if you took (it) for me, I should consent" etc. One knows that in Catalan also 'si' = 'if' is used instead of 'que' = 'that', when the clause which it introduces is in any way a matter of doubt. But a case like 'baditeke arima bat baino gehiago hitz horiec beretzat hartzeco balituzke' on p. 116 of B. S. H. is harder to explain. Either the 'ba' here really represents the relative pronoun 'Zein' or the whole sentence is very clumsily put together. On p. 271 in the sentence 'Lokharri hortaz bertze guziac hausten baginitu ere, bainan hori ez, baginuke aski, gure bihotza ez-pailiteke nihoiz bat-egin Jesus Jaunarenarekin,' the first 'ba' means 'if' the second 'indeed', and 'ez-pai,' 'because . . . not' or 'to result

in . . . not'. On p. 22 of 'Giristino Perfeccioniaren Pratica' (120 in M. Vinsons Bibliography) the words "cerc eguiten du Gincoaganaco gaucetan etor çunbait aldiz pitçu, eta eneatzen baita, eta beste aldi çunbaitez iniki, eta goçoz eguiten baititu?" can only mean "what brings it about *that* one is sometimes depressed and bored in the things that concern God, and *that* he does them at some other times easily and with pleasure?" 'Bai' cannot possibly mean 'because' here. The grammars do not appear to mention this use of the prefix 'ba' or 'bai' in the senses of the relative pronoun or the conjunctive suffix 'la'. But, on the whole, one may safely say that it can never mean 'parceque' when it occurs in a relative clause, or when preceded by a relative conjunction like 'non' ('no-n, in which')='where,' 'so that,' 'at which' or by words like 'zeren,' 'ezen,' 'nola' which themselves mean 'because' or 'how.' It may be seen therefore plainly that of all the verbal forms with this prefix in Pierre d'Urtes work there are only two, and those only for one occurrence, where this meaning is common-sensically possible. They are 'baita' in verse 15 on folio 125, 'Hori duc poblua ethórtçen baita eneganat,'="This, man, is 'because' the people come(s) to-me-wards". But even here the words might be rendered, "(The fact) is ('man!') that the people cometh unto me", taking 'bai' as the conjunction 'que' or "This (man!), is the people 'which' doth come unto me", taking 'bai' as the relative pronoun 'qui'. The French, however, being "*C'est que, le peuple vient à moi*", the sense of 'parceque' is just admissible. The other case is Ex: c. 14, v. 11 'baicaituc' where the sense of 'bai' is, however, rather 'in that', 'seeing that', 'since', 'to explain why,' than 'parceque.' In English it is 'that thou hast made us go out from Egypt', in French, "de nous avoir fait sortir d'Egypte?" Yet Mr. Vinson attaches this causal sense to 73 such forms! He sees 'parceque' where there is none in Moses, Calvin, or d'Urte. One could not spare space enough for the examination of each occurrence of every form that has this prefix; but let a few instances be adduced as a 'reductio ad absurdum.' Genesis c. 4, v. 1, 'Adamec bada eçagutu çuen bere Emaztea, çegnac conçebitu bait-çuen, eta erdi baitçen Caignez, eta erran bait-çuen, içatu dut guiçonbat Eternalganic': Which Mr. Vinsons 'passe-partout' would turn into, "So Adam knew his wife because she had conceived and been delivered of Cain, and because she said, I have gotten a man from God". Gen. c. 4, v. 9. "Eta Eternalac erran

çioen Caigni, non da Abel hire anaia? çegnac ihardetssi baitçuen etçeaquiât, ene anaiaren guarda naiz? ni?" "And the Eternal said to Cain, Where is Abel thy brother? Who because he answered I know not, man, am I my brothers keeper, I?" Gen. c. 4, v. 17, 'guero Caignac eçagutu çuen bere emaztea, çegnac conçebitu baitçuen', etc: "Afterwards Cain knew his wife, who because she conceived, etc." Verse 22, 'Eta Tsilla ere erdi içan çen Tubal-caigneç, çegna içatu baitçen olha-guiçona', 'And Zillah was delivered of Tubal-Cain, who because he was the smith', etc. This is indeed putting the cart before the horse! The heading of chapter 20 would mean, if Mr. Vinson were right, "Abraham makes his dwelling in Gera where because his wife is carried off by King Abimelech, who after being blamed and punished for his sake by the Lord because he returns Sara intact to Abraham, to whom because he makes great presents and afterwards is healed, etc." A delightful Galimatias indeed! The summary of chap. 35 ends 'çegnac signetssirican hil çela Iossep hartu baitçuen tristécia haundibat', which would mean "who from believing that Joseph is dead because he took upon him a great sadness." Exodus, I. 8, 'çegnac ezpaitçuen eçagutu Iossep' would mean not "which knew not Joseph", but, "who because he knew not Joseph". It is evident that in d'Urte, as in most other authors, this prefix is almost invariably a superfluous affirmative like 'point' after 'ne' in French, to which it corresponds exactly when preceded by the negative 'ez'. It is often very like the auxiliary 'do' in English. Before all things it is necessary to apply common-sense to the interpretation of Baskish which is a strictly logical language, a model of clearness fit for a Lord Chancellor. Basks cannot say in their own tongue any thing as vague as "two hens eggs", or "he has boiled water".

CORRIGENDA IN EDITIONE OXONIENSI.

F. 2, v. 20. read 'hedadura'. The MS has 'hedadura (ren)', but with the syllable 'ren' = 'of', barred out.

F. 5, v. 3. 'hun—(—)vquituco', is 'hura uquituco' correctly in Greatheeds most useful transcript, which was written before the original had had its margins clipped in the binding. It is however clear that the original had 'hura'. Only half of the 'a' is gone, and the word even so does not look much like 'hun' as written elsewhere. The editor should at least have marked the 'n-' as doubtful.

F. 6, v. 18. 'otheac' is not the right rendering of 'chardons'. It should be 'asto-carduac', literally 'ass-thistles'. 'Otheac' means 'furze bushes' and even, in some dialects, 'locusts'. The proper spelling of the word as locusts is, however, 'othiac'. But 'otheac' is generally pronounced in exactly the same way. Baskish 'e' before 'a' is like English 'e' in its sound. 'Larrepute=field-locust' Ex: c. 10. v. 12, etc. shews probably that 'ote' was once 'pote'. Other Baskish words beginning in 'o' have lost an initial 'p'.

F. 6, v. 22. The first 'n' in 'Ianquintssun' ought to have been marked as superfluous and incorrect. The scribe was doubtless thinking of 'jan' which occurs just below.

F. 8, Summary. The 'm' in 'Noeremgoco' should have been branded as a manuscriptal defect. The scribe put 'ra' quite rationally, though not very clearly, in 'Noereragnoco'. It means 'of' or 'belonging-to so far as Noah', i. e. of 'the era before Noah'. In modern writing it would probably be 'Noerañoko'. As d'Urte wrote it, it has three case-endings piled one on the top of the other. So in Gen. c. 48, v. 15, there is 'arterera-gno.'

F. 9, 8, v. 23. The 'c' in 'caürthurican' should be cedillated.

F. 9, v. 12, 'hala. leel' should have been marked as a misprint for 'halaleel'.

F. 9, v. 10 'hoigoi' is a misprint for 'hogoi'. The MS is not to blame.

F. 9, verso v. 27 the 'c' in 'Methuscela' ought to have been in Italic, because it is not cedillated. The same remark applies to that in the second syllable of 'concerba'. The omission of the 'cedille' is either a "fault escaped in the printing", or should have been noted as contrary to the general practice of the writer of the original. D'Urte used both 'ce', 'ci', and 'çe', 'çi', more generally the latter. My intention was to use them throughout in the second edition. It will be seen that d'Urte uses 'z' in some words instead of 'ç', and 'k' in others instead of hard 'c'.

Gen. c. 3, Summary. 'Errescatatcaillearen' ought to have a cedille under the 2nd 'c'. The Oxford editor had the 2nd 'at' marked as wrong. But it is quite in order, as the word comes from Castilian 'rescata'. On p. 100 of the oldest remaining book in Gipuskoan Baskish, the *Doctrina Christiana* of J. Ochoa de Arin (San Sebastián or Donostian 1713) 'rescatatcea' occurs, meaning 'the rescuing'. In this the 'tcea' is the articulate or determinate form of the ending of the verbal noun or infinitive and

equal to 'tça' in 'errescatatçaillearen' = of the 'rescuer' or 'redeemer'.

F. 10. v. 2. 'hetaric hartu çituztela emaztetçat beretçat' can only mean "taking them from them for (i. e. to the advantage of) the very self-same women". The termination 'tçat' can mean "in the capacity of", "to become"; but the laws of the use of 'bera' leave no doubt that 'emaztetçat beretçat' is not the right translation here. 'beretçat emaztetçat' might bear the right meaning; but it is not euphonic and scarcely clear. The real remedy is to read 'bere emaztetçat' meaning "to be their own wives". The author no doubt meant 'emaztetçat' to bear the one sense of 'tcat' and 'beretçat' to have the other. But the use of the same termination with different senses in each of two consecutive words is bad in any case. If, however, 'beretçat' be placed after 'emaztetçat' the Bask reader is forced to give to both terminations the self-same sense, and that makes none. D'Urte means to say "taking to themselves to wife", but he really writes "taking for the very wives", as if, that is, they were already married.

In Gen. c. 28, v. 2. 'hiredçat', 'emaztetçat' is not elegant, because here also 'tçat' has two different senses. The words were separated in the edition of 1899, just as in Gen. c. 12. v. 19 we have "eta enetçat hartu nuen emaztetçat".

F. 11, v. 17. In 'guçiey arımac egiñen diote' the verb 'diote' is a senseless blunder on the part of the scribe. In the 2nd edition I put in its place 'diraizteat' = 'I have them . . . to them O man!', which occurs in St. Luke's Gospel, c. 19. v. 8, in Leizarragas New Testament of 1571, reprinted, with all its defects and some new ones, in 1900.

The use of 'egiñen' appears to be justified by 'egin' in c. 14. v. 7, and recalls the phrase 'çintçurrac eguiteco' also; but as it is not now used in the sense of 'destroy' (vulgar 'do for'), and does not bear that meaning in the word-books, it were better to take it in both places as a slip of the pen for 'desegiñen' and 'desegin' respectively.

F. 13, in the summary the second 'i' in 'ilkitçera' is unduly loaded with two accents. The original is 'ilkhîçera', with ' above a circumflex on the second 'i'. Elsewhere also d'Urte has charged the letter 'i' with both dot and accent, e. g. f. 107, vo, v. 23, 'ihurtçiriac', which is quite bad enough, especially as the same word occurs on the next page without any accent.

F. 14, v. 13. 'Dadillala' is not marked as having one 'l' too many in the middle.

F. 14, v^o, v. 19 'besti' is not marked. It should, of course, be 'bestia', in which the 'a' is etymological and not the article.

F. 14, v^o, v. 21. The MS has 'gaztarassunetic'. The Oxford edition doubles the 'r'. Mine, of 1899 has 'gaztartassunetic;' but 'gaztetassunetic' would be more usual.

F. 16, v^o, in the Summary one reads 'Iaphethen', but thrice in the chapter 'Iaphethten'. One or the other of these forms should have been marked as a blunder. The latter of course is wrong.

F. 19, v^o, v. 29. The sense of the original is that the name of Nacors wife was Milcah, and that she was the daughter of Haran, who was the father of herself and Iiscar. The MS presents us with 'father' in apposition not with Haran (as it seems in English), but with Milcah, which makes nonsense. We see elsewhere that d'Urte was not good at pedigrees. All becomes clear if we read "alaba Haran baitçen Milcaren eta Iiscaren aita": making a new clause at the end, and inserting "Haran was father of Milcah and Iscar".

F. 23, v. 1. 'Araioc' is an evident mistake for 'Arioc' which occurs in v. 9. Calvin wrote 'Arioch'.

F. 23, v^o, v. 8. 'bere' after 'çuten' is needlessly repeated, but not noted as a 'lapsus calami'.

F. 24, v. 18. Read 'Melkisedec'. The MS has 'Melkisede' as if 'Melkisedec' were not the proper name, but the active nominative of 'Melkisede'. Compare d'Urtes misusing of 'Abimelec'. The active case of 'Melkisedec' would, of course, be 'Melkisedek'. Yet d'Urte has correctly put 'Melkisedeki' as the dative, c. 14, sum: 18. Harismendi has, p. 148 'Melchisedec handiaren' = 'of the great Melkisedec'.

F. 26, v. 7. After 'Eternalaren' (= 'of the Eternal') the word 'Aingueruac' has been omitted, both in the writing and in the printing, yet no note on it repairs the omission.

F. 26, v^o, 16. The omission of 'a' before the first 'e' in 'Ismelez' has also escaped censure. It is likewise a manuscriptal shortcoming.

F. 28, v. 18. Should not the 2nd 'o' in 'oçhola' (sic MS) have been marked for a mistake for 'a'?

F. 29, v^o, v. 14. 'gorderiçacóric?' should be marked as a miswriting of 'gordericacóric'. The edition of 1899 is also to blame. Some of its defects I had certainly marked on the proof.

F. 29, v^o, v. 17. The word 'diot' has been omitted in the MS before 'Abrahani'. The 1st edition does not restaur it.

F. 31, v^o, v. 14. On d'Urtes principles the 'c' in 'çela' should be 'ç'.

F. 31, v^o, v. 17. The final letter of 'salbac' should have been marked as superfluous. The MS is to blame. It was perhaps meant for 'e' the initial of 'eçac' instead of 'çac' the next word. But 'çac' is common in the book. The word 'salba' occurs correctly thrice on this page.

F. 31, v^o, v. 18. 'ciote' is the printers fault. The MS has 'çioten', correctly.

F. 33, v. 6. 'ez' after 'aüt' should be left out. D'Urte had at first written 'guardatu ere aüt ez bekhatu eguign ezteçaántçat'. Then in altering it he left the 'ez' where it is; striking out only 'gn ezteçaántçat'. He probably meant at first to put 'ezteçaántçat bekhatu eguign'.

F. 34. The foot-note should be 'egunen', not 'egunetaco'. The same misuse of the word 'urthe' = 'year' for 'egun' = 'day' occurs on f. 27. verso.

F. 35, v. 25. 'Abimele' should be 'Abimelec'. But 'Abimelequec' is required in c. 20 vv. 9, 10; in c. 21, vv. 26 and 29, and in all other places where the name occurs as nominative to an active or transitive verb. We find d'Urte using 'Abimelec' rightly as the passive nominative in c. 21, v. 22 and v. 32, where it governs 'çen' = 'was'. D'Urte observes the rules for other cases correctly as regards this name, e. g. G. c. 20, v. 3 and c. 21, v. 27, 'Abimelequi'; except c. 20, v. 18, where 'Abimelequen' would be right instead of 'Abimelen' as the MS gives. It is right in c. 21, v. 25. The Oxford edition did not check these errors. My own edition is also at fault.

In c. 20, v. 17 and c. 21, v. 25, 'Abimelec' is right as an accusative. The word follows of course the same rules as 'Isaac' for its declension. F. 41, v^o, v. 67 and elsewhere the MS has 'Isaaquec' rightly as the nominative governing 'çuen'. When he comes to c. 26, d'Urte is awake again, and writes 'Abimlecquec' or 'Abimelequec' where it is needed.

F. 36, v. 5. 'dugu' implies that 'astoa' (= 'the ass') is to be worshipped! That is the last object mentioned. Basks cannot say "we will adore". They must say "we will adore 'it' or 'them'". So the word *Eternala*, rendering *l'Éternel*, must be added. One remarks in other places a tendency on the part of d'Urte to omit the equivalent of words which happen to be in *Italic* in the French.

F. 36, v. 12. 'eztiocacala' ought to have been marked as a misprint of 'eztiocacala'. The MS is guilty.

F. 38, v^o, v. 12. The omission of 'graciazco bat' after 'incuntru', to render 'une heureuse', has not been marked.

F. 39, v. 15. The grammar does not quite correspond with the genealogy given above in c. 22, vv. 20-24. 'Emaztearena' should be 'emaztearen semearena'; and 'anaiaarena' should be 'anaiaaren semearena'. It is all right in v. 24, just below.

F. 39, v^o, v. 28. Read 'goan çen' not 'goäcen'. The MS is wrong.

F. 42, v. 9. The MS rightly has 'eta' not 'et'.

F. 42, v^o, v. 20. 'agé de quarante ans' should be 'berrogoy urtheren'; but Mr. Thomas put only 'berrogoyen' as a correction of the obvious error 'laurhogoÿen' which means 'of eighty'. In all other places where a persons age is recorded, d'Urte expresses the word 'years' as Calvin did in the French.

F. 43, v. 11. 'Dattes' has been translated 'pignu-fruituac' = 'pine-fruits'. D'Urte might as well have written 'pig-nuts'. Lar-ramendi has 'datila' for 'el datil'. The plural is 'datilac'.

F. 43, v^o, v. 1. 'Gerara' should be 'Gerarera'. The MS is wrong here. In v. 6 it is 'Geraren' rightly, in the locative case.

F. 43, v^o, v. 3. For 'hiri ondoreari' read 'hire ondoreari'. The MS is to blame, and the edition for not marking the mistake.

F. 44, v^o, v. 18. 'çituen', though needlessly repeated in the MS, is not marked as a mistake.

F. 46, v. 7. The last letter in 'dietçaquidaco' should have been marked as superfluous. M. J. Vinson omits it in his Appendix. The MS is at fault.

F. 46, v. 11. For 'illetts' read 'illetssua'. The MS is correct. In v. 29, 'aitçignenean' ought to be 'aitcigneane'. The scribe, having put 'aitçigne' = at the end of a line, began the next with = 'nean' instead of = 'an'. In v. 46, the MS has 'Rebecac'. Read 'Rebeccac'.

F. 48, v^o, v. 2, 'hartçat' should be 'har tçac'. The scribe thought of the 't' in the next word 'hiretçat', which he has separated by a comma from 'emaztetçat' thereby diminishing the awkwardness of such a collocation. This was overlooked in the printing.

F. 48, v^o, v. 4. 'hiri' = 'town', (perhaps Semitic in origin, if not a phonetic variety of 'huri', 'uri') seems to be a mistake for 'herri' = 'contry', 'land'. This can be used for 'hiri', but not 'hiri' for 'herri'.

F. 48, v^o, v. 7. Instead of 'çitue - ('n_i)' read 'çituela', as the word is on the same footing as 'çuela' in the preceding verse, and 'çela' just after it. In the MS it is 'citue' = at the end of a line. So it is clear that the scribe meant to begin the next with = 'la'.

F. 49, v^o, v. 3. The MS has rightly 'han', not 'hau'.

F. 50, v^o, v. 17 and f. 59, v. 13. 'mimbera' should be plural 'mimberac' as a predicative epithet, cf. f. 71, vo, v. 7 'triste çiren'.

F. 53, v. 33. 'aitçigneane' a mistake for 'aiçeneane', may be accounted for by the preceding 'aitçignera' three lines above. But in any case it is clumsy here, and another point in favour of the dictation theory.

F. 54, Summary. The printer put two dots and an accent on the 2nd 'i' in 'ichillican'. The original is 'ichillican,' or, possibly 'ichillican' with one dot and an accent over this 'i'.

F. 54, v^o, v. 13. 'arotan' should be 'hinarotan'. This mistake coming after 'eguign' = 'egin' is also probably to be explained as the result of dictation by d'Urte.

F. 55, v^o, v. 37. The MS has 'guc', but it should be 'gu'. In v. 12 the misprint in 'altçhac' is wrongly noted. The 'c' final should be suppressed, not cedillated.

F. 56, v^o, sum: read 'hirriscuaren'. The MS wrongly divides the word.

F. 56, v^o, v. 53. 'beçate' should be 'beça'. 'Iaincöec' as plural is heretical: but the French is 'les dieux'.

F. 58, v. 29. 'Iabec' in the MS should be 'Iacobec'. The edition marks it.

F. 59, v. 16. 'Sehirrat' should be 'Sehirrerat'. In c. 33, v. 14 it is 'Sehirrera'. Cf. G. c. 25, v. 18 'Assurera'.

F. 60, v^o, line 1. Read 'gucietaric', not 'gucietarie'. The MS is clear and right.

F. 61, v^o, v. 4. Instead of 'guçiuc', read 'guçiac' as the MS has it.

F. 62, v^o, v. 9. 'ete' ought to be marked as a mistake for 'eta'. The MS is innocent.

F. 63, 1. 1. add 'ez' as the termination of 'Rehuel'. The MS is wrong.

F. 65, v. 2. The words 'haren aitaren emazteac' = 'his fathers wives', are, to say the least, loosely placed. The last makes no grammatical sense from an Heuskarian point of view. It might be either accusative or nominative. It should be followed by

cirenen haürren artean = among the children of those who were his fathers wives, in Italic type. Here the author thought, as too many modern Bask writers do, in 'Erdara' the destructive foe of 'Heuskara'.

F. 65, v. 8. 'baldim' appears to be superfluous.

F. 69, v^o, v. 20 and F. 40, v. 3. Why is 'cartçela' marked as if its initial were wrong? It is merely Castilian 'carcel' with the Baskish 'a' = 'the' post-positive. (Note 'ce' = 'tce'.)

F. 70, v^o, v. 6. Is 'triste' a verbable radical = 'to be sad'? If not, ought not 'tristeac' to be used? cf. 'mimbera' c. 33, v. 13.

F. 70, v^o, v. 14, etc: 'gógara' for gógora occurs in other books, e. g. p. 227 of that of Harismendi.

F. 70, v. 23. 'revoioit' is translated 'egortçen' as if it were 'renvoioit'. The Oxford edition suggests no remedy, though it marks the word. 'Ikertcen' is the right word. Deafness and dictation again suggest themselves.

F. 71, v^o. In the Summary the MS omits the 'cedilla' under the first 'c' in 'ethorquicuneco', but there is no note on it.

F. 72, v. 8. 'Ejiptu' is a mistake for 'Egiptuco'. The hyphen at the end shews that the scribe meant to add 'co', for there is no hyphen before 'majiciano', the first word of the next line, as, according to the rule of the MS, there would have been if 'Ejiptu' had been meant to be joined onto it.

F. 76, v^o, v. 38 and F. 80, v^o, v. 31. 'dolorerequign' is wrongly marked as containing a misprint. 'Dolore' is the stem: and 'requign' is 'with'. 'Dolore' occurs for instance on pp. 161, 197 and 217 of the 'Dotrina Christiana' of E. Materre.

F. 79, v^o, v. 5 . . . 'ceña eguiazki eçagutuco baitic?' does not translate '& par laquelle très-assûrément il devinera?' but "and which he will truly recognise". In this verse 'non' translates 'dans laquelle' = 'no(r)n'. The ordinary word for 'diviner', 'asmatze', occurs G. c. 44, v. 15.

F. 79, v. 34. 'bonaçhira', marked as a slip of the pen for 'bonachera', which Harismendi has on p. 128, may be a reminiscence of the English 'good cheer' which d'Urte enjoyed in his exile before he lost his pension, or the Basks may have taken it from old French 'chiere'. In the same way his use of 'irrin lore' = 'flower' (of) 'flour' points to his work having been written in England.

F. 81, v. 34. After 'guertha' = at the end of a line the scribe must have meant to add not 'tçen', as Mr. Thomas did; but 'tceco', the futural ending, for the French has 'qui adviendra'.

F. 82, v. 16. 'çer', the interrogative pronoun has not been marked. It is an evident manuscriptal error for 'ceña', the relative pronoun.

F. 84, v. 20. 'Potipherath' ought to have been marked as a mis-writing of 'Potipherah'.

F. 87, v^o, v. 10. The second 'c' in 'baitçeçáquen' has not been marked. It should be 'ç'.

F. 88, v^o. In the Summary 'Iacobec' is a misprint for the possessive case 'Iacoben' = 'of Jacob'. The MS is right here.

F. 91, v^o, v. 10. For 'Adaco', as the MS has it, read 'Atadco', as in v. 11.

F. 92, v^o, v. 1. The last two letters of 'Israelenen' should have been bracketed for omission. The manuscript is wrong here.

F. 93, v^o, v. 16. The MS rightly has ditútçuen.

F. 94, v. 4. Some word has been omitted after 'eguignen' in the MS.

F. 95, v^o, 1. 3. 'erratten' ought to be 'erraten'. The MS is not erratic in this place.

F. 100. In the note read 'pipa' rather than 'ondoa'. Compare Gen. c. 14, v. 22.

F. 101, v^o, v. 16 and 18. 'Kehath' is no mistake, for it is spelt so in Calvins French. Cf. Gen. 46, v. 11 where d'Urte himself hesitated and put both 'Kohath' and 'Kehath'.

Folio 102, v. 33. No mark has been put to shew that the last four letters of 'arrebarena' have no business to be there. 'Arreba' means 'the sister' (in respect of a brother). Elisçebah was sister of Nahasson. But 'arrebarena' would mean "the (daughter) of the sister", as if she were, on the contrary, his niece. D'Urte, as we have already seen, was not cleverer at genealogical grammar than at botanical names.

Folio 107, v. 10. The copulative termination of 'Dakharz-quetenéquign' is surprising and quite wrong. The construction with 'billhatu' in the verse before being the simple nominative as predicate. He uses the copulative ending again quite wrongly, as is noted on f. 110, v. 18 of the Oxford edition, in Exodos c. 10, v. 18. 'Billhatu' = 'turned into'.

F. 108, v. 29. The initial letter of 'tituc' ought as much to be marked as it is in verse 9 of f. 104 v^o, as a mistake for 'd'. It is just possibly a dialectal peculiarity. But one gets 'gueldituco dituc' on f. 105.

F. 108, v^o, the note is incorrect. The word left unrepresented

by d'Urteis 'l'épeautre' in Calvins French. It would be 'la espelta' in Castilian, 'the spelt' in English. Larramendi in his Dictionary renders it by 'gari mota bat' which merely signifies 'a kind of grain' rightly adding "Lat. Spelta". One may safely suggest that the word 'escanda' will serve very well, as it is easier for a Bask to pronounce, and occurs in the old Castilian version. The Greek has *ἄλυστα* which may be of the same origin as Baskish 'olóa' = 'oats'. An 'r' between two vowels frequently falls out in the spoken Baskish, especially in the Souletin dialect.

F. 109, v. 7. The last clause in this verse is not rightly translated.

F. 112, v. 6. He translates l'égorgera' (= 'he will cut its throat') by 'larrutuco dic' which means 'l'écorchera'. Duvoisin uses the vague term 'hilen' = 'shall kill it'. Larramendi in his Dictionary translates 'degollar' by words compounded of 'throat' or 'neck' and 'cut'. Dictation again!

F. 113, v^o, v. 23. 'çuen' is needlessly repeated in the MS before 'etchétan'. This blunder is not indicated.

F. 114, v^o, v. 44. In 'ianengo' the double future ending is certainly a mistake in the MS. In the following and preceding verses 'ianen', which would suffice, is used; and so, I believe, everywhere else if 'manger' occurs in the future tense. The scribes eye caught 'içango' which occurs twice in the same verse.

F. 116. In the note read 'dituc' and not 'direla'.

F. 117, v^o, v. 11. The first 'c' in 'baicaituc' is no mistake, as the editor supposed. It is the 'g' of 'gaituc' with the ordinary mutation after the prefix, or possibly the old form of 'gaituc' only kept up when the prefix serves as a bulwark. Hard 'c' in Bask tends to turn into 'g'.

F. 117, v^o, v. 13. Of course 'ditut' and 'çuenac' form but a single word. So are 'baniat' and 'horc' on f. 124, v^o, v. 6. The scribe has put asunder many things that should be joined together.

F. 123, v^o, v. 5. 'Eta har tçac hire escuan çhigor: hartaz ibaia jo duäna, eta athor adi' is not a correct translation of: '& prens en ta main la verge, dont tu frapas la fleuve, & marche'. In the original the scribe put 'chigorrá' and then barred out the 'ra' = 'the' after a noun ending in 'r'. When he wrote 'çhigorrá' = 'the rod' he meant no doubt to go on with a relative clause beginning 'çeñaz' = 'with the which' and to put 'duc' or 'duan' instead of 'duana'. But he got into a muddle over it, and has given us both the instrumental case of a demonstrative pronoun

which one does not want, 'hartaz', and a relative verb declined in the accusative 'duäna', and the result is untranslatable, although one can guess at the meaning. If 'duana' is correct, 'hartaz' is needless. The relative 'dont' is expressed by the 'n' in 'duäna' which is the relational articulated form of 'duc', in which 'äna' means 'the (rod) with which'. The word is really the same as 'duäna' in c. 18, v. 17. The precise prepositional quality attached to the relative 'n' depends on the context of course. It belongs to both genders, to singular and plural, and to all cases. It is a most beautiful and catholic hinge-letter. Probably no language has a more convenient or effectual one. It may be compared to a 'point' on the railway for guiding a train off one road on to another. This is not the only proof that d'Urte did not understand the use of the relative pronoun 'n' as a verbal ending. There is for instance Ex: 18, v. 20. 'nondic goan direna' = 'par laquelle ils doivent marcher', where of course the article 'a' in 'direna' is quite superfluous and wrong, if 'nondic' be kept. The latter is quite right if followed by an unarticulated 'diren' as a simple conjunctive. 'Nondic' can mean either 'whence' 'from where' 'from . . . in which', or, as in this place, 'by' or 'through which'. Here its sense is fully expressed in the 'n' of 'direna'. He was not, however, the only author who did not understand the capabilities of the relative pronoun 'n'. We see its misuse in the words 'deusenari' (for 'deusenak'), 'jacanari' (for 'jacana'), in the *Refranes y Sentencias* printed at Pamplona in 1596 and in Geneva in 1896, a most important document.

Moreover Voltaire in his 'Trésor' has 'cein sor baikeituzuene-gatik', where 'cein' is superfluous with the 'n' of 'keituzuen'.

F. 124, v^o, v. 1. The MS reads correctly 'Iethro', not 'Iethroc' the word being in the same grammatical relation to 'aitaguign-harrauac' and 'çuen' as in verse 12 on the next side. This serves to shew that 'Saraic' in c. 16, v. 1, should be 'Sarai', though the scribe perhaps took 'bada' as a break in the four words which compose the nominative of 'etçioën'. Yet in G. c. 20, v. 2 'Abimelec bada Gerarco Erregeac' is an exactly similar case, and there 'Abimelec' is passive.

F. 126, v^o, v. 15. Instead of 'ganic' read 'ganat'. This deserved a foot-note as much as any of d'Urtes laughable blunders. Also on f. 118, v. 20, we have 'hurbildu bertceaganic' = 'near the other'. It must, however, be said that the Baskish idiom for 'near to' is 'near from', as in the Romance tongues, e. g. in French

'se rapprocher de la ville'. But d'Urte elsewhere uses 'hurbill' with 'gana' or 'ganat' generally, e. g. G. c. 33, v. 3. E. Materre, p. 281, has 'Hurbil çaite othoi ene arimara', i. e. 'approach Thou unto my soul', using 'ra' the directive case ending.

F. 128. In the note, instead of 'kharrac' read 'çhiçmiçtac', which occurs in c. 19, v. 16. The proper sense of 'kharra' is seen in 'kharretan', the locative case plural, Ex: c. 3, v. 2.

F. 128, v^o, v. 23. The MS has 'Iaincoric' all right, at the end.

F. 130, v^o, v. 35. The MS clearly gives 'erditican'. 'Orditican' is quite out of order.

p. 134, suppress 'afin'. p. 143, read 'citiztean'. p. 150, l. 15, read 'ait', not 'aie'. p. 162, after "Londres", 1870 insert "& 1876". After 1881 insert "London". To the list of Biblical translations one must also add the edition of the gospels of St. John and St. Luke published in 1884 by the Trinitarian Bible Society. They were printed from the plates already used by the British and Forane Bible Society, and issued in a new cover. M. J. Vinson omitted them in his valuable 'Bibliographie Basque' of 1891.

THE APOLOGY OF THE CRITIC.

I met the Revd. Llewelyn Thomas in the Library of Bayonne, B. P., in the summer of 1892, while he was chaplain to the Anglican Community in Biarritz; and he told me that he was learning Heuskara. So I informed him of the d'Urte manuscripts, and advised him to persuade the Delegates of the Clarendon Press to publish them, and produce the first Baskish book ever printed in Oxford. My suggestion bore good fruit, and our edition¹ appeared on the first of June, 1894; consisting, as I was informed by Mr. C. E. Doble, of five hundred copies. Nine months later I wrote a criticism on it, the draught of which Mr. Thomas himself forwarded for publication to The Academy. But, fortunately, its crudities escaped publicity, and it has developed into the present less imperfect essay, in which I can embody the results of my collation of the original manuscripts, realised first

¹ Some of its defects were removed in my own edition of the Genesis (Etórkia.), published on the 21st of February 1899 by the Trinitarian Bible Society, 25 New Oxford Street, London, W. C. In this the spelling was partially modernised. On p. 104, v. 9 the correction, erraten cioela, must be added to the list, and ciatáan.

for two hours on the afternoon of the 25th of September last at Shirburn Castle, and then at leisure during the whole of the following month in the Bodleian Library, where Lady Macclesfield very graciously caused them to be deposited on loan under the care of Mr. E. W. B. Nicholson. No review of the book having yet appeared in the *English Language*, I venture, after paying attention to Baskology for fifteen years, to submit my own to the notice of the curious, hoping that it will tempt them to learn Baskish, and be clear to them, if they have not begun. Mr. Thomas shewed great skill upon the whole in his editorial work. His plan was to reproduce the MS leaf by leaf, without amendment. He had learned a good deal of Baskish in a few months; but not quite enough to detect all the beams and motes in d'Urtes eye, or to avoid some blemishes of which the original is, as I always hoped, guiltless. I believe that I marked some of these in the proofing.

OXFORD, ALL HALLOWS DAY, 1901.

EDWARD SPENCER DODGSON.